arXiv:1702.03844v1 [math.NA] 13 Feb 2017

A RELAXED KAČANOV ITERATION FOR THE p-POISSON PROBLEM

LARS DIENING, MASSIMO FORNASIER, AND MAXIMILIAN WANK

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce an iterative linearization scheme that allows to approximate the weak solution of the p-Poisson problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{aligned}$$

for $1 < p \leqslant 2$. The algorithm can be interpreted as a relaxed Kačanov iteration. We prove that the algorithm converges at least with an algebraic rate.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study weak solutions of the p-Poisson equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is open and bounded and $1 < p < \infty$. The solution might be scalar or vector-valued.

Nonlinear problems of this type appear in many applications, e.g. non-Newtonian fluid theory [Lad67], turbulent flow of a gas in porous media, glaciology or plastic modeling. Moreover, the p-Laplacian has a similar model character for nonlinear problems as the ordinary Laplace equation for linear problems; see [Lin06] for an introduction.

As usual we are looking for the weak solution of (1.1). In particular, for we are searching for a function $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi \, dx = \langle f, \xi \rangle \quad \forall \xi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \tag{1.2}$$

where in the most general case $f \in (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^*$. It is well-known that this solution is unique and that it is the unique minizer of the energy $\mathcal{J} : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\mathcal{J}(v) := \tfrac{1}{p} \int_\Omega |\nabla v|^p \, dx - \langle f, v \rangle. \tag{1.3}$$

Due to the non-linear structure of the problem it is hard to obtain numerical solutions of this problem. Our goal is to construct solutions of (1.2) by means of a numerically accessible algorithm. In particular, we construct an iterative algorithm that approximates solutions of (1.2), where in each step only a linear problem has to be solved. We focus here on the iteration on the infinite dimensional space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. However, the same algorithm will immediately apply also to discretized versions of the p-Poisson problem, e.g. by means of finite elements or wavelets. This coincides with the approach discussed in [CU05] to first finding an iteration on the infinite-dimensional solution space and later discretize in space.

In this paper we restrict ourselves to the case $p \in (1, 2]$, since we are in particular interested in relative small values of p, also because the case of $p > 2$ is already

addressed to a certain extent in [CU05]. We will see in Example 4.3 that our algorithm actually only works properly for the range of $p \in (1, 2]$.

Coming from the weak formulation (1.2) one can interpret the problem as a weighted Laplace problem

$$\int_\Omega a^{p-2} \nabla u \cdot \nabla \xi \, dx = \langle f, \xi \rangle \quad \forall \xi \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \tag{1.4}$$

for suitable f, where $a : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and $a = |\nabla u|$. This suggests to iteratively calculate for a given function v_n the new iterate v_{n+1} as the solution of

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^{p-2} \nabla v_{n+1} \cdot \nabla \xi \, dx = \langle f, \xi \rangle \quad \forall \xi \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega).$$

The advantage of this step is that the calculation of v_{n+1} only requires to solve a linear problem. This allows to discretize this step later numerically. The problem with this approach however, is that the weighted Laplace problem is only well posed if a is bounded from above and from below away from zero. However, the weight $|\nabla v_n|^{p-2}$ degenerates, at points where $|\nabla u| = 0$ or $|\nabla u| = \infty$.

To overcome this problem we will use some relaxation arguments. Therefore, we introduce in our algorithm two relaxation parameters $\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+ \in (0, \infty)$ with $\varepsilon_- \leqslant \varepsilon_+$ that ensure that the weight is truncated properly from below and above. In particular, we replace a by its truncation

$$\varepsilon_- \vee a \wedge \varepsilon_+ := \max\{\varepsilon_-, \min\{a, \varepsilon_+\}\}.$$

Note that this is just the (pointwise) closest point projection of a to the truncation interval $[\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+]$. The limit $\varepsilon_- \searrow 0$ and $\varepsilon_+ \nearrow \infty$ will recover the unrelaxed or original problem. We also write $\varepsilon := [\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+]$ and interpret ε both as a pair $(\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+)$ and as the truncation interval $[\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+]$. We will write $\varepsilon \to [0, \infty]$ as a short version of $\varepsilon_- \searrow 0$ and $\varepsilon_+ \nearrow \infty$. We will see later, see Corollary 3.13, that for nice data f the lower parameter ε_- is the crucial one.

We suggest the following algorithm:

Algorithm: The relaxed p-Kačanov algorithm
Data: Given $f \in (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^*$, $v_0 \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$;
Result: Approximate solution of the p-Poisson problem (1.2);
Initialize: $\varepsilon_0 = [\varepsilon_{0,-}, \varepsilon_{0,+}] \subset (0, \infty)$, $n = 0$;
while *desired accuracy is not achieved yet* **do**
  Define $a_n := \varepsilon_{n,-} \vee |\nabla v_n| \wedge \varepsilon_{n,+}$;
  Calculate v_{n+1} by means of

$$\int_\Omega (\varepsilon_{n,-} \vee |\nabla v_n| \wedge \varepsilon_{n,+})^{p-2} \nabla v_{n+1} \cdot \nabla \xi \, dx = \langle f, \xi \rangle \qquad \forall \xi \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega);$$

  Choose new relaxation interval $\varepsilon_{n+1} \supset \varepsilon_n$.
  Increase n by 1;
end

Since $0 < \varepsilon_{n,-} \leqslant \varepsilon_{n,+} < \infty$ the equation for v_{n+1} in the algorithm is always well defined, since it is uniformly elliptic (with constant depending on ε_n). In Section 2 we provide a detailed derivation of this algorithm from a relaxed energy minimization problem with two parameters.

If we apply the algorithm with fixed relaxation parameter ε independent on n, i.e. $0 < \varepsilon_- \leqslant \varepsilon_+ < \infty$, then our iterates v_n converge to the unique minimizer u_ε of another relaxed energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$. We study this limit in Section 4 and present (linear) exponential rates.

In Section 3 we study how the minimizers u_ε of the relaxed energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ converge to the minimizer u of the original problem. This convergence can also be interpreted as a limit in the sense of Γ-convergence. We use a novel argument based on the Lipschitz truncation technique to establish a recovery sequence. However, we go beyond a pure Γ-limit and provide specific rates of convergence depending on ε.

Finally, in Section 5 we combine the estimates of the two previous sections to deduce an overall error analysis with algebraic rates.

2. Derivation of our Algorithm

In this section we show that the algorithm can be deduced from an alternating minimization of a relaxed energy. Recall that $1 < p \leqslant 2$ throughout this article. Since the case $p = 2$ is just the standard Laplace problem, it suffices in the following to consider the case $1 < p < 2$ only.

Let us introduce some standard notation. We use $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ for the Sobolev space without and with zero boundary values. We use c for a generic constant whose value may change from line to line. We also use $f \lesssim g$ for $f \leqslant c\, g$. We also write $f \eqsim g$ for $f \lesssim g$ and $g \lesssim f$.

The most important feature of the algorithm is that it only needs to solve linear sub-problems. Therefore, we extend the energy functional by an additional parameter $a : \Omega \to [0, \infty)$ such that the new functional is quadratic with respect to v. In particular, we define

$$\mathcal{J}(v, a) := \int_\Omega \tfrac{1}{2} a^{p-2} |\nabla v|^2 + (\tfrac{1}{p} - \tfrac{1}{2}) a^p \, dx - \langle f, v \rangle.$$

This energy is well-defined for all $v \in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ and measurable $a : \Omega \to [0, \infty)$ but might take the value ∞.

This relaxed energy in convex with respect to (v, a). This follows from the fact that $\beta(t, a) := \frac{1}{2} a^{p-2} t^2$ is convex on $[0, \infty)^2$, since

$$(\nabla^2 \beta)(t, a) = \begin{pmatrix} a^{p-2} & (p-2) a^{p-3} t \\ (p-2) a^{p-3} t & \frac{1}{2}(p-2)(p-3) a^{p-4} t^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive definite as $a^{p-2} \geqslant 0$ and $\det((\nabla^2 \beta)(t, a)) = a^{2p-6} t^2 (2-p)(p-1) \geqslant 0$. At this step we used $1 < p \leqslant 2$.

Remark 2.1. *If $p > 2$, then the relaxed energy $\mathcal{J}(v, a)$ is neither bounded from below nor convex with respect to a. Therefore, the algorithm derived below using the minimization with respect to a does not lead to a feasible problem for $p > 2$. See also Remark 4.4.*

Note that $\mathcal{J}(v, a)$ (for fixed a) is quadratic with respect to v and a minimization with respect to v leads formally to the elliptic equation

$$-\operatorname{div}(a^{p-2} \nabla v) = f,$$

see (1.4) for its weak form.

Unfortunately, the ellipticity of this system degenerates for $a(x) \to 0$ and $a(x) \to \infty$. To overcome this problem we restrict the minimization with respect to a (for fixed v) to functions with values within a relaxation interval $[\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+] \subset (0, \infty)$, i.e. $\varepsilon_- \leqslant a(x) \leqslant \varepsilon_+$. This minimization with respect to a (for fixed v) has a simple solution, namely

$$\operatorname*{arg\,min}_{a\,:\,\varepsilon_- \leqslant a \leqslant \varepsilon_+} \mathcal{J}(v,a) = \varepsilon_- \vee |\nabla v| \wedge \varepsilon_+, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\vee$ denotes the maximum and $\wedge$ the minimum, since

$$\tfrac{\partial}{\partial a}\Big(\tfrac{1}{2}a^{p-2}|\nabla v|^2 + (\tfrac{1}{p} - \tfrac{1}{2})a^p\Big) = \tfrac{2-p}{2}a^{p-3}(a^2 - |\nabla u(x)|^2).$$

This allows us to define for fixed $\varepsilon = [\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+] \subset [0, \infty]$ another relaxed energy

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) := \mathcal{J}\left(v, \varepsilon_- \vee |\nabla v| \wedge \varepsilon_+\right) = \min_{a\,:\,\varepsilon_- \leqslant a \leqslant \varepsilon_+} \mathcal{J}(v,a). \tag{2.2}$$

This immediately implies that the relaxed energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to ε, i.e., an increasing interval ε in terms of inclusion decreases the energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v)$.

This new relaxed energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ somehow "hides" the constrained minimization with respect to a. We can write $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ as

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) = \int_\Omega \kappa_\varepsilon(|\nabla v|)\,dx - \langle f, v\rangle$$

with $\kappa_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\kappa_\varepsilon(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_-^{p-2}t^2 + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})\varepsilon_-^p & \text{for } t \leqslant \varepsilon_- \\ \frac{1}{p}t^p & \text{for } \varepsilon_- \leqslant t \leqslant \varepsilon_+ \\ \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_+^{p-2}t^2 + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})\varepsilon_+^p & \text{for } t \geqslant \varepsilon_+. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\frac{1}{p}t^p \leqslant \kappa_\varepsilon(t)$ for all $t \geqslant 0$ and $\frac{1}{p}t^p = \lim_{\varepsilon \to [0,\infty]} \kappa_\varepsilon(t)$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. Since $\kappa_\varepsilon(t) \eqsim \varepsilon_+^{p-2}t^2$ for large t, we see that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) < \infty$ if and only if $v \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to [0,\infty]} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) = \mathcal{J}(v)$ for all $v \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{J}(v) \leqslant \liminf_{\varepsilon \to [0,\infty]} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v)$ for all $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Based on the above observations it is natural to iteratively minimize $\mathcal{J}(v,a)$ alternating between v and a. Certainly, we have also to increase the relaxation interval ε. Thus our algorithm reads as follows:

Algorithm: The relaxed p-Kačanov algorithm (energy version)
Data: Given $f \in (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^*$, $v_0 \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$;
Result: Approximate solution of the p-Poisson problem (1.2);
Initialize: $\varepsilon_0 = [\varepsilon_{0,-}, \varepsilon_{0,+}] \subset (0,\infty)$, $n = 0$;
while *desired accuracy is not achieved yet* **do**
  Calculate a_n by means of

$$a_n := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{a\,:\,\varepsilon_- \leqslant a \leqslant \varepsilon_+} \mathcal{J}(v_n, a);$$

  Calculate v_{n+1} by means of

$$v_{n+1} := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{v \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)} \mathcal{J}(v, a_n);$$

  Choose a new relaxation interval $\varepsilon_{n+1} \supset \varepsilon_n$;
  Increase n by 1;
end

This is just the algorithm given in the introduction written in different form.

3. Convergence in the Relaxation Parameter

In this section we show that the minimizers u_ε of the relaxed energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ converge to the minimizer u of $\mathcal{J}$ for $\varepsilon \to [0,\infty]$ and derive an upper bound for the relaxation error.

Since $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) \geqslant \mathcal{J}(v)$ and $\mathcal{J}$ is $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ coercive, it follows that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ is also $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ coercive. However, $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) < \infty$ requires $v \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$, as we have seen above. Certainly, there is a gap between the space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$. To close this gap we need a finer analysis of the energies, which requires the use of Orlicz spaces. We state in the following some standard results for these spaces, see for example [KR61].

A function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called an N-function if and only if there is a right-continuous, for $t > 0$ positive and non-decreasing function $\varphi' : \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\varphi'(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \varphi'(t) = \infty$ such that $\varphi(t) = \int_0^t \varphi'(\tau)\,d\tau$. An N-function is said to satisfy the Δ_2-condition if and only if there is a constant $c > 1$ such that $\varphi(2t) \leqslant c\,\varphi(t)$. For an N-function satisfying the Δ_2 condition we define the Orlicz space to consist of those functions $v \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega \varphi(|v|)\,dx < \infty$. It becomes a Banach space with the norm $\|f\|_\varphi := \inf\{\gamma > 0 : \int_\Omega \varphi(|v|/\lambda)\,dx \leqslant 1\}$. The Orlicz-Sobolev space $W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$ then consists of those $v \in L^\varphi$ such that the weak derivative ∇v is also in L^φ, equipped with the norm $\|v\|_\varphi + \|\nabla v\|_\varphi$. The space $W_0^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$ denotes the subspace of those functions from $W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$ with zero boundary values, which coincides with the closure of $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,\varphi}(\Omega)$. For example choosing $\varphi(t) := \frac{1}{p}t^p$ we have $L^\varphi(\Omega) = L^p(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,\varphi}(\Omega) = W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

The function κ_ε cannot be an N-function, since $\kappa_\varepsilon(0) \neq 0$, . However, if we define

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(t) := \kappa_\varepsilon(t) - \kappa_\varepsilon(0), \tag{3.1}$$

then φ_ε is an N-function. It can be verified that φ_ε satisfies the Δ_2-condition with a constant independent of ε.

Since $\varphi_\varepsilon(t) \eqsim \varepsilon_+^{p-2}t^2$ for large t and Ω is bounded, we have $L^{\varphi_\varepsilon}(\Omega) \eqsim L^2(\Omega)$. However, the constant of the embedding $L^{\varphi_\varepsilon}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ depends on ε, so this equivalence is of no big use. Instead we use the chain of embeddings

$$L^2(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\varphi_\varepsilon}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^p(\Omega), \tag{3.2}$$

with constants independent of ε. This follows from the fact that the Simonenko indices of φ_ε are within $[p,2]$.

Since φ_ε is strictly convex and $\kappa_\varepsilon(t) = \varphi_\varepsilon(t) + \kappa_\varepsilon(0)$, the energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ admits a unique minimizer $u_\varepsilon \in W_0^{1,\varphi_\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ whose Euler-Lagrange equation is

$$\int_\Omega (\varepsilon_- \vee |\nabla u_\varepsilon| \wedge \varepsilon_+)^{p-2}\nabla u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla\xi\,dx = \langle f,\xi\rangle \qquad \forall \xi \in W_0^{1,\varphi_\varepsilon}(\Omega). \tag{3.3}$$

At this we used that

$$\frac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(t)}{t} = (\varepsilon_- \vee t \wedge \varepsilon_+)^{p-2}. \tag{3.4}$$

Remark 3.1. *Let us consider the special case $\varepsilon_+ = \infty$. Then $\varphi_\varepsilon'(t) = (\varepsilon_- \vee t)^{p-2}t$. A similar definition, namely $\varphi_\varepsilon'(t) := (\varepsilon_- + t)^{p-2}t$ leads to the so-called shifted N-functions introduced in* [DE08]*, which has similar properties as our version, see for example Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 below. However, the version from this paper is much more suitable for our energy relaxation, since it is closer to the original function $\frac{1}{p}t^p$ on the truncation interval ε (the derivatives agree there).*

Since $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is the smallest space, see (3.2), which contains the u_ε and u, it is natural to consider all energies $\mathcal{J}$ and $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ as functionals on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with possible value ∞.

Let us recall that the goal of this section is to show that u_ε converges to u in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Since $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is uniformly convex, this strong convergence is a consequence of weak convergence and energy convergence $\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{J}(u)$. It is possible to show the weak convergence as well as that of the energy by means of Γ-convergence. Indeed, we will see in Remark 3.9 that $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \to \mathcal{J}$ in the sense of Γ-convergence. However, we will derive in the following much stronger results that provide us with a precise rate of convergence for the energies. This energy convergence implies strong convergence of the sequence, see the proof of Corollary 3.8.

Let us turn to the convergence of the energies $\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{J}(u)$ for $\varepsilon \to [0,\infty]$. Since $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to ε, it follows from the minimizing properties of u and u_ε that

$$0 \leqslant \mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u). \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove the stronger claim

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \to 0 \qquad \text{as } \varepsilon \to [0,\infty]. \tag{3.6}$$

In fact, we will later need this stronger estimate in the other sections.

It follows from the minimizing property of u_ε that

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u) - \mathcal{J}(u).$$

So it would be natural to estimate $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u) - \mathcal{J}(u)$ in terms of ε and u. However, the solution u is unfortunately a priori only a $W_0^{1,p}$-function, so $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u)$ might be infinity. Hence, we cannot assure that this difference is small. This is only possible if we assume higher regularity of u. In order to treat arbitrary right-hand sides $f \in (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^*$ at this point, we have to use a much more subtle argument. For this we need a result from [DKS13, Subsection 3.5] and [BDS16, Theorem 2.7], which allows to change u on a small set such that it becomes a Lipschitz function. This technique is known as the *Lipschitz truncation technique*. Its origin goes back to [AF88]. As a tool we need the Hardy-Littlewood operator, e.g. [SM93],

$$(Mg)(x) := \sup_{r>0} \fint_{B_r(x)} |g|\,dx := \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{|B_r(x)|} \int_{B_r(x)} |g|\,dx$$

where $|B_r(x)|$ denote the Lebesgue measure of $B_r(x)$.

Theorem 3.2 (Lipschitz trunction [DKS13, BDS16])**.** *Let $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and for all $\lambda > 0$ define*

$$\mathcal{O}_\lambda := \mathcal{O}_\lambda(v) := \{x \in \Omega \,:\, M(\nabla v)(x) > \lambda\},$$

Then, there exists an approximation $T_\lambda v \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ of v with the following properties:

(a) $\{v \neq T_\lambda v\} \subset \mathcal{O}_\lambda$,
(b) $\|T_\lambda v\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$,
(c) $\|\nabla T_\lambda v\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$,
(d) $|\nabla T_\lambda v| \lesssim \lambda \chi_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} + |\nabla v| \chi_{\Omega\setminus\mathcal{O}_\lambda} \leqslant \lambda$ *almost everywhere,*
(e) $\|\nabla(v - T_\lambda v)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla v\|_{L^p(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)}$,
(f) $v_\lambda \to v$ *in* $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ *as* $\lambda \to \infty$.

All our convergence results concerning the relaxation parameter ε are based on the following result, which shows how the energy relaxation depends on the truncation interval ε.

Theorem 3.3. *The estimate*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \lesssim \varepsilon_-^p + \int\limits_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla u|^p \, dx \tag{3.7}$$

holds for all $\lambda \leqslant \varepsilon_+/c_1$, where c_1 is the (hidden) constant from Theorem 3.2 (d).

Proof. Let $\lambda \leqslant \varepsilon_+/c_1$ and let $T_\lambda u$ be the Lipschitz truncation of u. Then

$$|\nabla T_\lambda u| \leqslant c_1 \, \lambda \leqslant \varepsilon_+.$$

Using the minimizing property of u_ε and the equation for u we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(T_\lambda u) - \mathcal{J}(u) &= \int\limits_\Omega \kappa_\varepsilon(|\nabla T_\lambda u|) - \tfrac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p \, dx - \langle f, T_\lambda u - u\rangle \\ &= \int\limits_\Omega \kappa_\varepsilon(|\nabla T_\lambda u|) - \tfrac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p \, dx - \int\limits_\Omega |\nabla u|^{p-2}\nabla u \cdot \nabla(T_\lambda u - u)\, dx.\end{aligned}$$

Using $|\nabla T_\lambda u| \leqslant \varepsilon_+$, $\kappa_\varepsilon(t) = \frac{1}{p}t^p$ for $t \in [\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+]$, $\kappa_\varepsilon(t) \leqslant \frac{1}{p}\varepsilon_-^p$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon_-]$, and $T_\lambda u = u$ outside of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ we get

$$\kappa_\varepsilon(|\nabla T_\lambda u|) - \tfrac{1}{p}|\nabla u|^p \leqslant \begin{cases} \frac{1}{p}\varepsilon_-^p & \text{on } \{|\nabla T_\lambda u| \leqslant \varepsilon_-\}, \\ 0 & \text{on } \big(\Omega \setminus \mathcal{O}_\lambda\big) \cap \{|\nabla T_\lambda u| > \varepsilon_-\}, \\ \frac{1}{p}|\nabla T_\lambda u|^p & \text{on } \mathcal{O}_\lambda \cap \{|\nabla T_\lambda u| > \varepsilon_-\}. \end{cases}$$

This, the previous estimate and Theorem 3.2 (e) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) &\leqslant |\Omega| \, \tfrac{1}{p}\varepsilon_-^p + \int\limits_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} \tfrac{1}{p}|\nabla T_\lambda u|^p \, dx + \int\limits_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla u|^{p-1}|\nabla(T_\lambda u - u)| \, dx \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon_-^p + \int\limits_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla T_\lambda u|^p \, dx + \int\limits_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla u|^p \, dx + \int\limits_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla(T_\lambda u - u)|^p \, dx \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon_-^p + \int\limits_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla u|^p \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.4. *$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{J}(u)$ and $\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{J}(u)$ as $\varepsilon \to [0, \infty]$.*

Proof. Due to (3.5) it suffices to prove $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{J}(u)$. Consider the right-hand side of (3.7) with $\lambda := \varepsilon_+/c_1$. The first term goes to zero as $\varepsilon_- \to 0$. Now consider the second term. Since $\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u) \subset \{M(\nabla u) > \lambda\}$ and $\nabla u \in L^p(\Omega)$ we get by the weak L^p-estimate of the maximal operator $|\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)| \lesssim \lambda^{-p}\|\nabla u\|_p^p$. Therefore $|\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)| \to 0$ as $\varepsilon_+ \to \infty$, which implies $\int_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla u|^p \, dx \to 0$ as $\varepsilon_+ \to \infty$. □

Before we continue we need the following natural quantities, see [DE08].

Definition 3.5. *For $P \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we define*

$$A_\varepsilon(P) := \begin{cases} \frac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(|P|)}{|P|}P & \text{if } P \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } P = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad V_\varepsilon(P) := \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(|P|)}{|P|}}P & \text{if } P \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } P = 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, by $A := A_{[0,\infty]}$ and $V := V_{[0,\infty]}$ we denote the unrelaxed versions.

For the ease of readability we skip the proofs of the next two lemmas, which are minor modifications of [DE08, Lemma 3] and [DK08, Lemma 16]. Full details can be found in [RD07].[1]

[1]The proofs in the references are based on second derivatives of the Orlicz functions and our φ_ε are not C^2 at the points ε_- and ε_+. However, one can easily replace in the proofs the second derivatives of φ_ε by the upper and lower derivative of φ_ε'.

Lemma 3.6. *For $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$(A_\varepsilon(P) - A_\varepsilon(Q)) \cdot (P - Q) \eqsim \frac{\varphi'_\varepsilon(|P| \vee |Q|)}{|P| \vee |Q|} |P - Q|^2 \eqsim |V_\varepsilon(P) - V_\varepsilon(Q)|^2.$$

where the constants can be chosen independently of ε.

Lemma 3.7. *The following estimates hold for arbitrary $v \in W_0^{1,\varphi_\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ and u_ε being the minimizer of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) &\leqslant \int_\Omega (A_\varepsilon(\nabla v) - A_\varepsilon(\nabla u_\varepsilon)) \cdot \nabla(v - u_\varepsilon)\, dx \\ &\lesssim \int_\Omega |V_\varepsilon(\nabla v) - V_\varepsilon(\nabla u_\varepsilon)|^2\, dx \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

We are now prepared to show the convergence of minimizers u_ε of $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ to u.

Corollary 3.8. *$u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon \to [0, \infty]$.*

Proof. Due to Corollary 3.4 we have $\mathcal{J}(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to [0, \infty]$. Now Lemma 3.7 with $\varepsilon = [0, \infty]$ implies that $V(\nabla u_\varepsilon) \to V(\nabla u)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. It follows from the shift-change-lemma [DK08, Corollary 26] that for all $\delta > 0$ there exists $c_\delta > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla u - \nabla u_\varepsilon|^p \leqslant c_\delta |V(\nabla u_\varepsilon) - V(\nabla u)|^2 + \delta |\nabla u|^p.$$

This and $V(\nabla u_\varepsilon) \to V(\nabla u)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ implies $\nabla u_\varepsilon \to \nabla u$ in $L^p(\Omega)$. □

Remark 3.9 (Γ-convergence)**.** *It is also possible to deduce $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{J}(u)$ and $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ by means of Γ-convergence: As the underlying topological space we choose $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ equipped with the weak topology. Then the Lipschitz truncation provides a recovery sequence for $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ implying $\Gamma\text{-}\lim_{\varepsilon \to [0,\infty]} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon = \mathcal{J}$. Indeed, it follows as in the proof of Theorem 3.3 that for all $v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$*

$$\big|\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(T_{\varepsilon_+/c_1} v) - \mathcal{J}(v)\big| \lesssim \varepsilon_-^p + \int_{\mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon_+/c_1}(v)} |\nabla v|^p\, dx + \big|\langle f, T_{\varepsilon_+/c_1} v - v\rangle\big|.$$

So the properties of the Lipschitz truncation, see Theorem 3.2 (f), imply that the right-hand side goes to zero as $\varepsilon \to [0, \infty]$. Hence, $T_{\varepsilon_+/c_1} v$ is a recovery sequence of v.

Moreover, $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon \geqslant \mathcal{J}$, so the standard theory of Γ-convergence proves $u_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \to \mathcal{J}(u)$ for $\varepsilon \to [0, \infty]$. The uniform convexity of $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ implies $u_\varepsilon \to u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

To our knowledge this is the first time that the Lipschitz truncation is used to construct a recovery sequence.

Up to now, we discussed the convergence of $u_\varepsilon \to u$ without any additional assumptions on the data $f \in (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^*$ and the domain Ω. If f is more regular and $\partial\Omega$ is suitably smooth, then we obtain specific rates for the convergence. The rates of convergence will follow from the regularity of ∇u in terms of the weak-L^q spaces $L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)$, which consists of those functions such that

$$\|v\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)} := \sup_{t>0} \|t\, \chi_{\{|v|>t\}}\|_{L^q(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\nabla u \in L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)$ for some $q > p$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \lesssim \varepsilon_-^p + \varepsilon_+^{-(q-p)} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)}^q.$$

Proof. First note that $M : L^{q,\infty}(\Omega) \to L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)$ is bounded. This follows for example by extrapolation theory, see [CUMP04, Theorem 1.1]. In particular,

$$\lambda|\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)|^{\frac{1}{q}} \eqsim \|\lambda\,\chi_{\{M(\nabla u)>\lambda\}}\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \leqslant \|M(\nabla u)\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)}.$$

Moreover, let $L^{q,1}(\Omega)$ denote the usual Lorentz space, which consists of functions v such that

$$\|v\|_{L^{q,1}(\Omega)} := q\int_0^\infty |\{|v|>t\}|^{\frac{1}{q}}\,dt = q\int_0^\infty \|t\,\chi_{\{|v|>t\}}\|_{L^q(\Omega)}\frac{dt}{t} < \infty.$$

Since $(L^{s',1})^* = L^{s,\infty}$ for $1 < s < \infty$ and $\frac{1}{s}+\frac{1}{s'}=1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)} |\nabla u|^p\,dx &\lesssim \big\||\nabla u|^p\big\|_{L^{\frac{q}{p},\infty}(\Omega)}\|\chi_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)}\|_{L^{\frac{q}{q-p},1}(\Omega)}\\ &\eqsim \|\nabla u\|^p_{L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)}|\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u)|^{\frac{q-p}{q}}\\ &\lesssim \|\nabla u\|^q_{L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)}\,\lambda^{-(q-p)},\end{aligned}$$

where $|\mathcal{O}_\lambda|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Applying Theorem 3.3 with $\lambda := \varepsilon_+/c_1$ yields the statement. □

To exemplify the consequence of our convergence result Lemma 3.10 we combine it with the regularity results of [CM10] and [Ebm02]:

Theorem 3.11 ([CM10], Theorems 1.3 and 1.4)**.** *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be convex or let its boundary $\partial\Omega \in W^2L^{d-1,1}$ (for example $\partial\Omega \in C^2$ suffices) and additionally $f \in L^{d,1}(\Omega)$. Then $\nabla u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.*

Theorem 3.12 ([Ebm02], (4.3))**.** *Let Ω be a polyhedral domain where the inner angle is strictly less than 2π and $f \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ and $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{p'}=1$. Then $\nabla u \in L^{\frac{pd}{d-1},\infty}$.*

Proof. Actually, it is proven in [Ebm02] (4.3) that $|\nabla u|^{\frac{p}{2}} \in \mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Omega)$ (Nikolskiĭ space). Now, one can use the embedding $\mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{2d}{d-1},\infty}(\Omega)$ of Lemma 6.1 in the appendix. □

Corollary 3.13. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.11 we have*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \lesssim \varepsilon_-^p.$$

Proof. Since $\nabla u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have $M(\nabla u) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and so for $\lambda := \varepsilon_+/c_1$ and ε_+ large enough, $\mathcal{O}_\lambda(u) = \emptyset$. Hence, Theorem 3.3 implies the estimate. □

Corollary 3.14. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.12 we have*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \lesssim \varepsilon_-^p + \varepsilon_+^{-\frac{p}{d-1}}$$

Proof. Since $\nabla u \in L^{\frac{pd}{d-1},\infty}(\Omega)$, an application of Lemma 3.10 finishes the proof. □

Remark 3.15. *The choice $f = 0$ and hence $u = 0$ gives $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u) = \kappa_\varepsilon(0)|\Omega| \eqsim \varepsilon_-^p$. This shows that the estimate in Corollary 3.13 is sharp.*

4. Convergence of the Kačanov-Iteration

In this section we study the convergence of the Kačanov-iteration for fixed relaxation parameter $\varepsilon = [\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+]$. In particular, for $v_0 \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ arbitrary we calculate recursively v_{n+1} by

$$\int_\Omega (\varepsilon_- \vee |\nabla v_n| \wedge \varepsilon_+)^{p-2} \nabla v_{n+1} \cdot \nabla \xi \, dx = \langle f, \xi \rangle \quad \forall \xi \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega). \tag{4.1}$$

We will show that v_n converges to the minimizer u_ε of the relaxed energy $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$. In particular, we show exponential decay of the energy error $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)$. The proof is based on the following estimate, proved below.

Theorem 4.1. *There is a constant $c_K > 1$ such that*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_{n+1}) \geqslant \delta \left(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \right)$$

holds for $\delta := \frac{1}{c_K} (\frac{\varepsilon_-}{\varepsilon_+})^{2-p}$.

This theorem says that in each iteration we reduce the energy by a certain part of the remaining energy error. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_{n+1}) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) &= \big(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \big) - \big(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_{n+1}) \big) \\ &\leqslant (1-\delta) \big(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

As a direct consequence we will obtain the following exponential convergence result.

Corollary 4.2. *There is a constant $c > 1$ such that*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \leqslant (1-\delta)^n (\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_0) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)).$$

holds for $\delta := \frac{1}{c} (\frac{\varepsilon_-}{\varepsilon_+})^{2-p}$.

Let us get to the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Using Lemma 3.7, the equation for u_ε and Young's inequality we get for arbitrary $\gamma > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) &\leqslant \int_\Omega (A_\varepsilon(v_n) - A_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)) \cdot \nabla(v_n - u_\varepsilon) \, dx \\ &= \int_\Omega \tfrac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(|\nabla v_n|)}{|\nabla v_n|} \nabla(v_n - v_{n+1}) \cdot \nabla(v_n - u_\varepsilon) \, dx \\ &\leqslant \underbrace{\tfrac{1}{\gamma} \tfrac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \tfrac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(|\nabla v_n|)}{|\nabla v_n|} |\nabla(v_n - v_{n+1})|^2 \, dx}_{=:I} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\gamma \, \tfrac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \tfrac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(|\nabla v_n|)}{|\nabla v_n|} |\nabla(v_n - u_\varepsilon)|^2 \, dx}_{=:II}. \end{aligned}$$

Let use define

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v, a) := \mathcal{J}\left(v, \varepsilon_- \vee a \wedge \varepsilon_+\right)$$

For the first term I we calculate with the equation (4.1) for v_{n+1}

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \tfrac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \tfrac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(|\nabla v_n|)}{|\nabla v_n|}|\nabla(v_n - v_{n+1})|^2\,dx \\ &= \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n, |\nabla v_n|) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_{n+1}, |\nabla v_n|) \\ &\leqslant \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n, |\nabla v_n|) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_{n+1}, |\nabla v_{n+1}|) \\ &= \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

For the second term II we use $\varepsilon_+^{p-2} \leqslant \frac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(t)}{t} \leqslant \varepsilon_-^{p-2}$, Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 to get

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}(\tfrac{\varepsilon_+}{\varepsilon_-})^{2-p}\int_\Omega \tfrac{\varphi_\varepsilon'(|\nabla v_n|\vee|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)}{|\nabla v_n|\vee|\nabla u_\varepsilon|}|\nabla(v_n - u_\varepsilon)|^2\,dx \\ &\leqslant c\,(\tfrac{\varepsilon_+}{\varepsilon_-})^{2-p}\,(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

Putting all estimates together we get

$$\gamma(1 - c\gamma(\tfrac{\varepsilon_+}{\varepsilon_-})^{2-p})\,(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)) \leqslant \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_{n+1}).$$

Now, $\max_{\gamma>0}\gamma(1 - c\gamma(\frac{\varepsilon_+}{\varepsilon_-})^{2-p}) = \frac{1}{4c}(\frac{\varepsilon_-}{\varepsilon_+})^{2-p}$ yields the statement. □

Example 4.3 (Peak function)**.** *Let $\Omega := B_1(0)$ and $f(x) = -\operatorname{div}(\frac{x}{|x|})$. Then $f \notin L^1(\Omega)$ but still $f \in (W_0^{1,1}(\Omega))^* \subset (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^*$. Then the minimizer of $\mathcal{J}$ is given by $u(x) = 1 - |x|$, which look like a peak. Since $|\nabla u| \equiv 1$, the factor $|\nabla u|^{p-2}$ in the p-Laplace does not appear for the minimizer. So in this case u also minimizes every $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon$ as long as $\varepsilon_- \leqslant 1$ and $\varepsilon_+ \geqslant 1$. This follows from*

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u) = \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant \mathcal{J}(v) \leqslant \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v)$$

for all $v \in W_0^{1,\varphi_\varepsilon}(\Omega)$.

Let us see how our algorithm performs with the start value $v_0 := 0$. It is easy to see that $v_n = \alpha_n u$ with

$$\alpha_0 := 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{n+1} := (\varepsilon_- \vee \alpha_n \wedge \varepsilon_+)^{2-p}. \tag{4.3}$$

Since $p \in (1,2)$ one can show $\alpha_n = \varepsilon_-^{(2-p)^n}$ by induction and

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u) = \tfrac{1}{p}|B_1(0)|(\varepsilon_-^{p(2-p)^n} - 1 - p(\varepsilon_-^{(2-p)^n} - 1)).$$

Note that

$$\tfrac{1}{p}t^p - \tfrac{1}{p} - (t-1) \leqslant \tfrac{p-1}{2}(\ln(t))^2 \qquad \text{for all } t \in (0,1].$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\frac{1}{p}t^p - \frac{1}{p} - (t-1)}{\frac{p-1}{2}(\ln(t))^2} \to 1 \qquad \text{as } t \nearrow 1.$$

This estimate with $s := (2-p)^n \in (0,1]$ and $t := \varepsilon_-^s \in (0,1]$ gives

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}|B_1(0)|(p-1)\ln(\varepsilon_-)^2(2-p)^{2n}$$

is sharp. Indeed, the energy differences $\mathcal{J}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u) = \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)$ asymptotically behave like $\frac{1}{2}|B_1(0)|(p-1)\ln(\varepsilon_-)^2(2-p)^{2n}$ for large n.

This shows that it is impossible to get an energy reduction as in (4.2) with δ independent of ε. Indeed, Corollary 4.2 would imply

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \leqslant (1-\delta)^n\big(\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_0) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)\big) \leqslant (1-\delta)^n\mathcal{J}_1(v_0),$$

which contradicts the above calculations.

Nevertheless, our asymptotic shows that in this particular case

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) \leqslant c_\varepsilon\,(1-\delta)^n$$

with $1-\delta = (2-p)^2 < 1$ *independent of* ε. *Therefore, it remains open if such an estimate holds in the general case.*

Remark 4.4. *Although our considerations are all under the assumption* $1 < p \leqslant 2$ *it is interesting to check how the algorithm performs in the case* $p > 2$ *for our Example 4.3.*

If $p \geqslant 3$ *and* $\varepsilon_+ := \frac{1}{\varepsilon_-}$ *for some* $\varepsilon_- < 1$, *then it follows from* (4.3) *that*

$$\alpha_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_n = \varepsilon_-^{(-1)^n(p-2)} \quad \text{for } n \geqslant 1.$$

Therefore, our Kačanov iteration does not converge as $p \geqslant 3$.

If $p \in (2,3)$ *and* $\varepsilon_+ := \frac{1}{\varepsilon_-}$, *then it follows from* (4.3) *that*

$$\alpha_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_n = \varepsilon_-^{(2-p)^n} \quad \text{for } n \geqslant 1$$

and v_n *still converges to* u.

5. Algebraic Rate

As we learned in the last section the Kačanov iteration converges for fixed ε, but the rate depends badly on the choice of the relaxation interval $\varepsilon = [\varepsilon_-, \varepsilon_+]$. Furthermore, we have algebraic convergence of the error $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u)$ induced by the relaxation. We will combine these results to deduce an algebraic rate of the full error $\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)$ in terms of n for a specific predefined choice of ε_n. To achieve our goal we will use that $|\nabla u| \in L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)$ for some $q > p$, which is justified by Theorems 3.11 and 3.12.

Let us consider a sequence of solutions created by our relaxed p-Kačanov algorithm. In particular, ε_n is now a sequence. Then exactly as in Theorem 4.1 we get the following estimate.

Theorem 5.1. *There is a constant* $c_K > 1$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_{n+1}) \geqslant \delta_n\,(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(u_{\varepsilon_n}))$$

holds for $\delta_n := \frac{1}{c_K}\big(\frac{\varepsilon_{n,-}}{\varepsilon_{n,+}}\big)^{2-p}$.

Since $\varepsilon_n \subset \varepsilon_{n+1}$, we have $\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_{n+1}} \leqslant \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}$. This and Theorem 5.1 imply

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}(v_{n+1}) - \mathcal{J}(u)\\
&\quad\leqslant \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_{n+1}) - \mathcal{J}(u)\\
&\quad= \big(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)\big) - \big(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_{n+1})\big)\\
&\quad\leqslant \big(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)\big) - \delta_n\big(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(u_{\varepsilon_n})\big)\\
&\quad= (1-\delta_n)\big(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)\big) + \delta_n\big(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(u_{\varepsilon_n}) - \mathcal{J}(u)\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, Lemma 3.10 and $|\nabla u| \in L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)$ ensure the existence of $c_R > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant c_R(\varepsilon_-^p + \varepsilon_+^{-(q-p)}). \tag{5.1}$$

This and the previous estimate therefore imply

$$\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}(v_{n+1}) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant (1-\delta_n)\big(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)\big) + \delta_n c_R(\varepsilon_{n,-}^p + \varepsilon_{n,+}^{-(q-p)}). \tag{5.2}$$

Without the last term $\delta_{n+1}c_R(\varepsilon_{n,-}^p + \varepsilon_{n,+}^{-(q-p)})$ we would get a reduction of the error $\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)$ by the factor $(1-\delta_n)$. On the other hand this last term is small if $\varepsilon_{n,-} \to 0$ and $\varepsilon_{n,+} \to \infty$, so it should not bother too much. Nevertheless, the reduction factor $(1-\delta_n)$ tends to 1 if $\varepsilon_{n,-} \to 0$ and $\varepsilon_{n,+} \to \infty$. The idea

however is the following: if δ_n goes to zero slowly, then the product $\prod_{i=1}^n(1-\delta_i)$ still tends to zero algebraically.

Let us be more precise. We define another relaxed energy $\mathcal{G}_n$ by

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) + K_1\,(\varepsilon_{-,n}^p + \varepsilon_{+,n}^{-(q-p)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_\infty := \mathcal{J}(u), \tag{5.3}$$

where $K_1 > 0$ will be determined below. Moreover, choose

$$\alpha, \beta > 0 \text{ with } \alpha + \beta \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2-p} \tag{5.4}$$

and define

$$\varepsilon_n := [(n+1)^{-\alpha}, (n+1)^{\beta}]. \tag{5.5}$$

Then

$$\delta_n = \tfrac{1}{c_K}\big(\tfrac{\varepsilon_{n,-}}{\varepsilon_{n,+}}\big)^{2-p} = \tfrac{1}{c_K}((n+1)^{-\alpha-\beta})^{2-p} \geqslant \tfrac{1}{c_K}\tfrac{1}{n+1}. \tag{5.6}$$

In particular, the algorithm with this choice of ε_n reads as follows:

Algorithm: The relaxed p-Kačanov algorithm with algebraic rate
Data: Given $f \in (W_0^{1,p}(\Omega))^*$, $v_0 \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$;
Result: Approximate solution of the p-Poisson problem (1.2);
Initialize: $n = 0$; $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that $\alpha + \beta < \frac{1}{2-p}$;
while *desired accuracy is not achieved yet* **do**
  Define $\varepsilon_n := [(n+1)^{-\alpha}, (n+1)^{\beta}]$;
  Calculate v_{n+1} by means of

$$\int_\Omega (\varepsilon_{n,-} \vee |\nabla v_n| \wedge \varepsilon_{n,+})^{p-2}\nabla v_{n+1}\cdot\nabla\xi\,dx = \langle f, \xi\rangle \qquad \forall \xi \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega);$$

  Increase n by 1;
end

We continue to derive a decay estimate for $\mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty$.

Lemma 5.2. *There exists $K = K(\alpha,\beta,p,q)$ (which appears in the definition of $\mathcal{G}_n$) and some $c_3 = c_3(\alpha,\beta,p,q) \geqslant 1$, such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$(\mathcal{G}_{n+1} - \mathcal{G}_\infty) \leqslant (1 - \tfrac{1}{c_3(n+1)})(\mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty).$$

Proof. Define

$$\rho_n := \varepsilon_{-,n}^p + \varepsilon_{+,n}^{-(q-p)}) = (n+1)^{-\alpha p} + (n+1)^{-(q-p)\beta}.$$

Hence it follows by Lemma 6.2 that there exists $c_2 = c_2(\alpha,\beta,p,q) \geqslant 1$ with

$$\rho_n - \rho_{n+1} \geqslant \frac{1}{c_2}\frac{1}{n+1}\rho_n. \tag{5.7}$$

In particular, ρ_n satisfies a decay estimate!

On the other hand it follows from Theorem 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}(v_{n+1})\\
&\quad\geqslant \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_{n+1})\\
&\quad\geqslant \delta_n\,(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(u_{\varepsilon_n}))\\
&\quad\geqslant \frac{1}{c_K}\frac{1}{n+1}\,(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(u_{\varepsilon_n}))\\
&\quad= \frac{1}{c_K}\frac{1}{n+1}\,(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)) - \frac{1}{c_K}\frac{1}{n+1}(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(u_{\varepsilon_n}) - \mathcal{J}(u)).
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce from (5.1), the definition of ε_n and ρ_n that

$$\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant c_R(\varepsilon_{n,-}^p + \varepsilon_{n,+}^{-(q-p)}) = c_R\rho_n.$$

This and the previous estimate prove

$$\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}(v_{n+1}) \geqslant \frac{1}{c_K}\frac{1}{n+1}\left(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)\right) - \frac{c_R}{c_K}\frac{1}{n+1}\rho_n.$$

Since $\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) + K_1\rho_n$, it follows together with (5.7) that

$$\mathcal{G}_{n+1} - \mathcal{G}_n \geqslant \frac{1}{c_K}\frac{1}{n+1}\left(\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u)\right) + \left(\frac{K_1}{c_2} - \frac{c_R}{c_K}\right)\frac{1}{n+1}\rho_n.$$

We finally fix K_1: We choose K_1 so large such that

$$\frac{K_1}{c_2} - \frac{c_R}{c_K} \geqslant \frac{K_1}{2\max\{c_K, c_2\}},$$

which is always possible. Combining this with our previous estimates we deduce

$$\mathcal{G}_{n+1} - \mathcal{G}_n \geqslant \frac{1}{2\max\{c_K, c_2\}}\frac{1}{n+1}(\mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty).$$

This proves the theorem with $c_3 = 2\max\{c_K, c_2\}$. □

We are now able to present our convergence result.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $|\nabla u| \in L^{q,\infty}(\Omega)$ for some $q > p$ (for example see Lemma 3.10). Then, the algorithm just described satisfies for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant \mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty \leqslant n^{-\frac{1}{c_3}}\left(\mathcal{G}_0 - \mathcal{G}_\infty\right),$$

where c_3 is the constant of Lemma 5.2. In particular, the energy error decreases at least algebraically.

Proof. The estimate $\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) - \mathcal{J}(u) \leqslant \mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty$ is obvious, so it remains to prove the decay of $\mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty$. If follows from Lemma 5.2 that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty \leqslant \prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\left(1 - \tfrac{1}{c_3(i+1)}\right)(\mathcal{G}_0 - \mathcal{G}_\infty).$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{i=0}^{n}\left(1 - \tfrac{1}{c_3(i+1)}\right) &= \exp\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n}\ln\left(1 - \tfrac{1}{c_3(i+1)}\right)\right) \leqslant \exp\left(-\sum_{i=0}^{n}\frac{1}{c_3(i+1)}\right)\\ &\leqslant \exp\left(-\frac{\ln(n)}{c_3}\right) = n^{-\frac{1}{c_3}}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

Remark 5.4. *We have seen that the choice $\varepsilon_n = [(n+1)^{-\alpha}, (n+1)^{\beta}]$ ensures that the error decreases at least with an algebraic rate. However, the decay of the relaxed energy error $\mathcal{G}_n - \mathcal{G}_\infty$ can never be faster than algebraically with this choice of ε_n. Hence, this choice is also very restrictive. From numerical experiments we performed, we have seen that it is possible to decrease $\varepsilon_{n,-}$ and increase $\varepsilon_{n,+}$ much faster and still obtain convergence. Moreover, the observed convergence is much faster than algebraic and more of exponential type. We will present the details of such numerical experiments in a future paper. Let us summarize: the algorithm of this section ensures an algebraic convergence rate, but in practice we expect a better behavior for other choices of ε_n, still to be investigated.*

6. Appendix

The following embedding is probably well known. However, since we could not find a reference for it and we need it for the proof of Theorem 3.12, we include a short proof.[2] In the following $\mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{2},2}$ denotes the usual Nikolskiĭ space, see e.g. [KOF77].

Lemma 6.1. $\mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{2d}{d-1},\infty}(\Omega)$.

Proof. We will not recapitulate the definitions of the occurring spaces. First of all, we use the identity

$$\mathcal{N}^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Omega) = B^{\frac{1}{2}}_{2,\infty}(\Omega)$$

as stated in [KOF77, Remark 8.4.5], where $B^s_{p,q}(\Omega)$ denotes the standard Besov spaces. In [Tri78, Theorems 1 and 2 in 4.3.1] we find the interpolation pair $\{B^{\frac{1}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega), B^{\frac{3}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega)\}$ such that

$$B^{\frac{1}{2}}_{2,\infty}(\Omega) = (B^{\frac{1}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega), B^{\frac{3}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},\infty}$$

holds. The embeddings (see [EEK06] respectively [Pee66])

$$B^{\frac{1}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{4d}{2d-1}}(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad B^{\frac{3}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{4d}{2d-3}}(\Omega)$$

yield

$$(B^{\frac{1}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega), B^{\frac{3}{4}}_{2,1}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},\infty} \hookrightarrow (L^{\frac{4d}{2d-1}}(\Omega), L^{\frac{4d}{2d-3}}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},\infty}.$$

Finally, by [Tri78, Theorem 2 in 1.18.6] we get

$$(L^{\frac{4d}{2d-1}}(\Omega), L^{\frac{4d}{2d-3}}(\Omega))_{\frac{1}{2},\infty} = L^{\frac{2d}{d-1},\infty}(\Omega). \qquad \square$$

Moreover, in the proof Lemma 5.2 we used the following algebraic estimate:

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\gamma > 0$. Then for all $n \geqslant 1$ we have*

$$n^{-\gamma} - (n+1)^{-\gamma} \geqslant n^{-\gamma-1} \min\{\tfrac{\gamma}{2}, 1 - 2^{-\gamma}\}.$$

Proof. We define $h : [0, \frac{1}{2}] \to \mathbb{R}$ via $h(t) := 1-(1-t)^\gamma$. Note that $h'(t) = \gamma(1-t)^{\gamma-1}$ and $h''(t) = \gamma(1-\gamma)(1-t)^{\gamma-2}$. For $\gamma \geqslant 1$ this implies that h is concave, so

$$h(t) \geqslant t\Big(\tfrac{h(\frac{1}{2})-h(0)}{\frac{1}{2}}\Big) = 2(1-2^{-\gamma})t.$$

On the other hand, if $\gamma \in (0,1)$, the function h is convex. Therefore,

$$h(t) \geqslant h(0) + th'(0) = \gamma t.$$

This implies $h(t) \geqslant \min\{\gamma, 2(1-2^{-\gamma})\}t$. Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-\gamma} - (n+1)^{-\gamma} &= n^{-\gamma}(1 - (1 - \tfrac{1}{n+1})^\gamma) = n^{-\gamma} h(\tfrac{1}{n+1}) \\ &\geqslant n^{-\gamma} \min\{\gamma, 2(1-2^{-\gamma})\} \tfrac{1}{n+1} \geqslant n^{-\gamma-1} \min\{\tfrac{\gamma}{2}, 1-2^{-\gamma}\}. \qquad \square \end{aligned}$$

[2] We thank W. Sickel for explaining the details to us.

References

[AF88] E. Acerbi and N. Fusco, *An approximation lemma for $W^{1,p}$ functions*, Material instabilities in continuum mechanics (Edinburgh, 1985–1986), Oxford Sci. Publ., Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1988, pp. 1–5.

[BDS16] Miroslav Bulíček, Lars Diening, and Sebastian Schwarzacher, *Existence, uniqueness and optimal regularity results for very weak solutions to nonlinear elliptic systems*, arXiv:1602.00119 (2016).

[CM10] Andrea Cianchi and Vladimir G. Maz'ya, *Global Lipschitz Regularity for a Class of Quasilinear Elliptic Equations*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations **36** (2010), no. 1, 100–133.

[CU05] Claudio Canuto and Karsten Urban, *Adaptive optimization of convex functionals in Banach spaces*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **42** (2005), no. 5, 2043–2075 (electronic). MR 2139236 (2005m:90081)

[CUMP04] D. Cruz-Uribe, J. M. Martell, and C. Pérez, *Extrapolation from A_∞ weights and applications*, J. Funct. Anal. **213** (2004), no. 2, 412–439.

[DE08] Lars Diening and Frank Ettwein, *Fractional estimates for non-differentiable elliptic systems with general growth*, Forum Mathematicum **20** (2008), no. 3, 523–556.

[DK08] L. Diening and Ch. Kreuzer, *Linear convergence of an adaptive finite element method for the p-Laplacian equation*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **46** (2008), 614–638.

[DKS13] Lars Diening, Christian Kreuzer, and Endre Süli, *Finite Element Approximation of Steady Flows of Incompressible Fluids with Implicit Power-Law-Like Rheology*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis **51** (2013), no. 2, 984–1015.

[Ebm02] Carsten Ebmeyer, *Mixed Boundary Value Problems for Nonlinear Elliptic Systems with p-Structure in Polyhedral Domains*, Mathematische Nachrichten **236** (2002), no. 1, 91–108.

[EEK06] David E. Edmunds, W. Desmond Evans, and Georgi E. Karadzhov, *Sharp estimates of the embedding constants for Besov spaces*, Rev. Mat. Complut. **19** (2006), no. 1, 161–182. MR 2219827 (2007a:46027)

[KOF77] Alois Kufner, John Oldrich, and Svatopluk Fučík, *Function spaces*, Noordhoff International Pub, Leyden, 1977.

[KR61] Mark A. Krasnosel'skiĭ and Yakov B. Rutickiĭ, *Convex functions and Orlicz spaces*, Cambridge Univ Press, 1961.

[Lad67] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, *New equations for the description of motion of viscous incompressible fluids and solvability in the large of boundary value problems for them*, Proc. Stek. Inst. Math. **102** (1967), 95–118.

[Lin06] Peter Lindqvist, *Notes on the p-laplace equation*, `http://www.math.ntnu.no/~lqvist/p-laplace.pdf`, 2006.

[Pee66] Jaak Peetre, *Espaces d'interpolation et théorème de Soboleff*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **16** (1966), no. fasc. 1, 279–317. MR 0221282 (36 #4334)

[RD07] Michael Růžička and Lars Diening, *Non-Newtonian fluids and function spaces*, NAFSA 8—Nonlinear analysis, function spaces and applications. Vol. 8, Czech. Acad. Sci., Prague, 2007, pp. 94–143.

[SM93] Elias Stein and Timothy Murphy, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton mathematical series, Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1993.

[Tri78] Hans Triebel, *Interpolation theory, function spaces, differential operators*, North-Holland Pub. Co, Amsterdam New York, 1978.